

May 24, 2007

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form
(Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/98)

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

ZAP 06-011, Log No. 06-19-008

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

3. a. Contact, Michael Johnson, Planner

b. Phone number: (858) 505-6380

c. E-mail: Michael.Johnson1@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

The project site is located at 9451 Jamacha Blvd, Spring Valley, CA 91901 in the Spring Valley Community Planning Area in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. APN # 584-440-24

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1291, Grid C-3

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Franklin Orzco
Cricket Communications, Inc
4031 Sorrento Valley Blvd.
San Diego, CA 92121

6. General Plan Designation 13
Community Plan: Spring Valley
Land Use Designation: CUDA
Density: N/A

7. Zoning
Use Regulation: C36
Density: N/A
Special Area Regulation: B
8. Description of project (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation):

The project is a Minor Use Permit for a proposed unmanned wireless telecommunication facility. The project consists of one 40-foot high flag pole with three sector panel antenna array with one antenna per sector and radio and power equipment located over 100 feet to the south in an equipment cabinet measuring 10 feet long by 16 feet wide by 8 feet tall. The project site is located at 9451 Jamacha Boulevard in the Spring Valley Community Planning area, within unincorporated San Diego County. The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category CUDA (Current Urban Development Area), Land Use Designation 13 (General Commercial). Zoning for the site is C36 (General Commercial). The site contains an existing automotive repair shop that will be retained. Access is be provided by Jamacha Boulevard.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

The surrounding land use is relatively flat and is zoned C36 and RS7 and is occupied by commercial buildings and multifamily residential buildings to the south. The project site is occupied by F&H auto repair.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Permit Type/Action

Minor Use Permit

Agency

County of San Diego

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Haz. Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

_____ Signature	_____ May 24, 2007 Date
_____ Michael Johnson Printed Name	_____ Land Use/Environmental Planner Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways or County designated visual resources. Based on a site visit completed by project staff on April 13, 2006, the proposed project is not located near or visible from a scenic vista and will not change the composition of an existing scenic vista. The proposed telecommunications facility is located at 9451 Jamacha Boulevard, Spring Valley, CA, in a commercial zone. The project antennas will be camouflaged inside a flag pole and the associated equipment cabinet will be shielded by proposed landscaping consisting of Bougainvillea helping incorporate the site with its surroundings. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated. A scenic highway is officially designated as a State scenic highway when the local jurisdiction adopts a scenic corridor protection program, applies to the California Department of Transportation for scenic highway approval, and receives notification from Caltrans that the highway has been designated as an official Scenic Highway. Based on a site visit completed by project staff on April 13, 2006, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the same composite viewshed as a State scenic highway and will not change the visual composition of an existing scenic resource within a State scenic highway. Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The proposed telecommunications facility is located at 9451 Jamacha Boulevard, Spring Valley, California. The antennas are disguised as a flag pole and the associated equipment cabinet is camouflaged by the existing building and proposed landscaping.

The closest highway is CA 125. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as commercial and residential uses to the south. The project does not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site because it is disguised as a flag pole, with the antennas being fully hidden from view. In addition, the equipment cabinet is small in comparison the existing buildings and will be shielded by proposed landscaping.

The proposed project is an unmanned telecommunications facility. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality for the following reasons: the antennas will be disguised inside a flag pole and the proposed equipment enclosure will be shielded by proposed landscaping and will blend in with the existing building on the site.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and will not contribute to a cumulative impact for the following reasons: the antennas will be disguised inside a new flag pole and the proposed equipment enclosure will be shielded by proposed landscaping and will blend in with the existing building on the site. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any use of outdoor lighting or building materials with highly reflective properties such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Therefore, the project will not create any new sources of light pollution that could contribute to skyglow, light trespass or glare and adversely affect day or nighttime views in area.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES -- In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site and surrounding area, within a radius of one mile, do not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned C36, which is not considered to be an agricultural zone. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

- c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site and surrounding area within a radius of one mile do not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Operation of the project will not result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. Therefore, the project will not conflict or obstruct with the implementation of the RAQS nor the SIP on a project or cumulative level.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) has established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. For CEQA purposes, these screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the CEQA Air Quality Handbook for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which has stricter standards for emissions of ROCs/VOCs than San Diego's, is appropriate. However, the eastern portions of the county have atmospheric conditions that are characteristic of the Southeast Desert Air Basin (SEDAB). SEDAB is not classified as an extreme non-attainment area for ozone and therefore has a less restrictive screening-level. Projects located in the eastern portions of the County can use the SEDAB screening-level threshold for VOCs.

The project proposes an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in an average of 2 trips a month. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for criteria pollutants. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O₃). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀) under the CAAQS. O₃ is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Less Than Significant Impact: Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM₁₀, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, as well as VOCs as the result of increase of traffic from operations at the facility. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in PM₁₀ and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in an average of one trip a month. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for VOCs and PM₁₀.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM₁₀, or any O₃ precursors.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality.

Less Than Significant Impact: The following sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project: La Presa Elementary School and Mt. Miguel Elementary School.

However, based on review by the DPLU staff air quality specialist, Mario Covic, this project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations.

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the proposed project as well as the listed projects have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified in association with the proposed project. As such, no impact from odors is anticipated.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a site visit by project staff on April 13, 2006, it has been determined that the site has been completely disturbed and contains no native vegetation or habitats. Therefore, no species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would be expected to occur on-site.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: County staff, Gustavo Perez, has conducted a site visit on April 13, 2006, and determined that the proposed project site does not contain any riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities as defined by the *County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program*, *County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance*, *Natural Community Conservation Plan*, *Fish and Game Code*, *Endangered Species Act*, *Clean Water Act*, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations. In addition, no riparian or otherwise sensitive habitat has been identified within or adjacent to the area proposed for off-site impacts resulting from road improvements, utility extensions, etc. Therefore, the project is not expected to have direct or indirect impacts from development on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: County staff, Gustavo Perez, has conducted a site visit on April 13, 2006, and determined that the proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act in which the Army Corps of Engineers maintains jurisdiction over.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a site visit by Gustavo Perez on April 13, 2006, it has been determined that the site has been completely disturbed and contains no native vegetation or habitats. Therefore, impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impedance of the use of native wildlife nursery sites would not be expected as a result of the proposed project.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated March 13, 2007 for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP) Special Area Management Plans (SAMP) or any other local policies or ordinances that protect

biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not impact historical resources, because prior grading of the project site has eliminated any potential for impacts to buried historical resources. Moreover, the site is vacant of buildings and does not support any historical resources of any kind.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego staff archaeologist Gail Wright on April 14, 2006, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources.

- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Unique Paleontological Resources - A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History, combined with available data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that have high resource potential. High resource

potential is assigned to geologic formations known to contain paleontological localities with rare, well-preserved, critical fossil materials for stratigraphic or paleoenvironmental interpretation, and fossils providing important information about the paleobiology and evolutionary history of animal and plant groups. In general, highly sensitive formations are considered to have the potential to produce vertebrate fossil remains.

However, the project will result in a less than significant impact to paleontological resources, because the project does not propose any grading that will exceed a cut depth of 10 feet. The minimum graded cut depth of 10 feet is the approximate depth at which bedrock is unweathered and is the depth at which unique paleontological resources can typically begin to be found. This excavation guideline is based on professional opinions of paleontological experts from the San Diego Natural History Museum and discussions with City and County of San Diego staff. Therefore, the project will not result in the permanent loss of significant paleontological information. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable loss of information, because all projects that exceed a cut depth of 10 feet and will disturb the unweathered bedrock in the areas with high or moderate resource potential are required to have a paleontological monitor present during grading operations.

Unique Geologic Features – The site does contain any unique geologic features that have been catalogued within the Conservation Element (Part X) of the County's General Plan or support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features. Additionally, based on a site visit by Gustavo Perez on April 13, 2006 no known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, on April 14, 2006, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?
Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the California Building Code (CBC) classifies all San Diego County with the highest seismic zone criteria, Zone 4. However, the project is not located within 5 kilometers of the centerline of a known active-fault zone as defined within the Uniform Building Code's Maps of Known Active Fault Near-Source Zones in California. In addition, the project will have to conform to the Seismic Requirements -- Chapter 16 Section 162- *Earthquake Design* as outlined within the California Building Code. Section 162 requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved by a County Structural Engineer before the issuance of a building or grading permit. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking as a result of this project.

- iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The geology of the project site is identified as Eocene Marine and Nonmarine. This geologic environment is not susceptible to ground failure from seismic activity. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure.

iv. Landslides?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Also, staff geologist has determined that the geologic environment of the project area is not located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Huerhuero-Urban land complex, 9 to 30 percent slopes that has a soil erodibility rating of "slight" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. Moreover, the project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.

c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project. On a site visit conducted by Gustavo Perez on April 13, 2006, no geological formations or features were noted that would produce unstable geological conditions as a result of the project. For further information refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils on-site are Huerhuero-Urban land complex, 9 to 30 percent slopes. However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility. The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity.

- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not contain, handle, or store any potential sources of chemicals or compounds that would present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Although the project is located within one-quarter mile of an existing school, the project does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. However, this proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because there will be no disturbance to the land and the proposed structure will be unmanned.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports; or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a framework document that provides direction to local jurisdictions to develop specific operational area of San Diego County. It provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan for will not be interfered with because the project is located outside a dam inundation zone.

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is completely surrounded by urbanized areas, and/or irrigated lands and there are no adjacent wildland areas. Also, a FP-2 Letter March 9, 2007 has been received from Ed Hayman, Fire Marshal for the Department of Planning and Land Use. The letter stated that the project, with the 8-foot slump stone CMU as noted on sheet A-3, was found to be in compliance with the FP-2 policy. The conditions from the FP-2 letter include:

- o Facility Standby Power: emergency power or uninterrupted power supplies shall be in accordance with Article 64, Stationary Lead-Acid Battery Systems of the California Fire Code. Sign(s) must be posted as required in California Fire Code Section 6404.7
- o Fire Radio Interference: Interference with fire department radio communication from cellular cell sites shall be corrected immediately by the applicant.

Therefore, based on the location of the project; review of the project by County staff; and through compliance with the FP2 conditions, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires.

- i) Expose people to significant risk of injury or death involving vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. lagoons, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by

Gustavo Perez on April 13, 2006, there are none of these uses on adjacent properties. Therefore, the project will not expose people to significant risk of injury or death involving vectors.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose waste discharges that require waste discharge requirement permits, NPDES permits, or water quality certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB). In addition, the project does not propose any known sources of polluted runoff or land use activities that would require special site design considerations, source control Best Management Practices (BMPs) or treatment control BMPs, under the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01).

b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project lies in the Jamacha hydrologic subarea, within the Sweetwater hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003, although portions of the San Diego Bay are impaired for coliform bacteria, no portion of the Sweetwater River, which is tributary to the Bay, is impaired. Constituents of concern in the Sweetwater River watershed include coliform bacteria and trace metals.

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: There will be soil disturbing activities that will result in exposed soil areas. This includes minor grading and trenching and there will be temporary on-site storage of construction materials, including mortar mix, raw landscaping and soil stabilization materials, treated lumber, rebar, and plated metal fencing materials. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed

such that potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters:

- Silt Fencing;
- Fiber Rolls;
- Stockpile Management;
- Gravel Bag Berms; and
- Any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit will be protected by covering with plastic tarp prior to a rain event, and will have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final building approval.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and San Diego Unified Port District includes the following: Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Ordinance No. 9426 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by project category, what Dischargers must do to comply with the Ordinance and to receive permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects to follow which intend to improve water quality from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Storm water Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

- ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Jamacha hydrologic subarea, within the Sweetwater hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; preservation of biological habitats of special significance; and rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility and will not use water for any purposes.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve construction of new or expanded development that could alter the drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The proposed project will not alter the existing natural topography, vegetation, or drainage courses on-site or off-site.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless
Mitigation Incorporated

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve construction of new or expanded development that could alter the drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. The proposed project will not alter the existing natural topography, vegetation, or drainage courses on-site or off-site.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless
Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.

- h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless
Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: There will be soil disturbing activities that will result in exposed soil areas. This includes minor grading and trenching and there will be temporary on-site storage of construction materials, including mortar mix, raw landscaping and soil stabilization materials, treated lumber, rebar, and plated metal fencing materials.. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or

treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable:

- Silt Fencing;
- Fiber Rolls;
- Stockpile Management;
- Gravel Bag Berms; and
- Any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit will be protected by covering with plastic tarp prior to a rain event, and will have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final building approval.

Refer to VIII Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

- i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site; therefore, no impact will occur.

- j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site; therefore, no impact will occur.

- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area including a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

l) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

No Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Also, staff geologist, Jim Bennett, has determined that the geologic environment of the project area is not located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity. In addition, the project does propose land disturbance that will expose soils and the project is not located downstream from exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose or introduce new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy CUDA (Current Urban Development Area) and General Plan Land Use Designation 13 (General Commercial). The project is consistent with the General Plan because civic uses are allowed if they tend to support the local population. The project is also consistent with the Public Safety Element, Policy 4 on Page VII-27: The County of San Diego will encourage and support the establishment and continual improvement of a County-wide emergency telephone communications system (911) to improve the response time between the occurrence of an incident and the dispatching of emergency units. The project is subject to the policies of the Spring Valley Community Plan. The property is zoned C36 which permits wireless facilities under the civic use types subject to a Major Use Permit and pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 6985. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with plan and zone.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Although the project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of undetermined mineral resources MRZ-3, staff geologist has reviewed the site's geologic environment and has determined that the site

is not located within an alluvial river valley or underlain by coastal marine/non-marine granular deposits. Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and the residents of the state will occur as a result of this project. Moreover, if the resources are not considered significant mineral deposits, loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned C-36, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000).

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: The project is a proposed Cricket Communications Facility consisting of two CMO equipment cabinets and a single PPC cabinet. Based on a site visit completed by Eilar Associates on July 30, 2006, and as described in the Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates and dated August 14, 2006, the project is zoned C36 and the surrounding area supports C36 & RS7. The project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive area to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A),

modifications must be made to project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates and dated August 14, 2006, project implementation will not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates and dated August 14, 2006, non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned C36 that has a one-hour nighttime average sound limit of 55 dBA. The adjacent properties, south of the project site are zoned RS7 and have one-hour nighttime average sound limit of 45 dBA. In order for the Department to make a determination on the project's conformance with San Diego County noise standards, the applicant must demonstrate that the hourly average sound levels do not exceed the arithmetic mean of both thresholds resulting in 50 decibels (dBA) at the property line, as the most stringent Noise Ordinance condition for the project. The proposed Cricket project consists of two Nortel CMO equipment cabinets and a single PPC cabinet enclosed within an 8-foot high CMU block wall. Proposed Cricket equipment will be adjacent to an existing auto repair shop, located on the western facade of this building. Based on the Eilar Noise Impact Analysis, the proposed Cricket equipment enclosed within the 8-foot CMU block wall will generate sound levels as high as 41.3 dBA at the western property line. Therefore, the proposed Cricket Communications facility will meet the property line noise level limits of the County Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404).

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-410

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates and dated August 14, 2006, the project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, It is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75 dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b) and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404 and 36.410) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards

established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: Auto repair shop activities and traffic noise from Jamacha Boulevard & Paraiso Avenue. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise

control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates dated August 14, 2006. Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level.

The project will not result in cumulatively noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace any existing housing since the site is currently used for commercial and/or industrial uses.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the site is currently vacant.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate existing services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: San Miguel Consolidated Fire Protection District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XIV. RECREATION

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any residential use, included but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobilehome park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will result in an additional 2 trips per month. The project was reviewed by DPW staff and was determined not to result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions for the following reasons: The proposed project generates 2 additional trips. Given the County's traffic thresholds (Table 1) 100 ADT on a road operating at LOS F and 200 ADT on a road operating at LOS E there would be no direct impacts to a road segment. Using SANDAG's estimate for AM and PM peak hour trips, the project would generate less than five peak hour trips and will not exceed the five additional trips to a critical move threshold - especially when the trips are distributed on the road network. Therefore, the project will not have a significant direct project impact on traffic volume, which is considered substantial in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Also refer to the answer for XV. b. below.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will result in an additional two trips per month. The project was reviewed by DPW staff and was determined not to exceed a level of service (LOS) standard at the direct project level for the following reasons: The proposed project generates two additional trips. Given the County's traffic thresholds (Table 1) 100 ADT on a road operating at LOS F and 200 ADT on a road operating at LOS E there would be no direct impacts to a road segment. Using SANDAG's estimate for AM and PM peak hour trips, the project would generate less than five peak hour trips and will not exceed the five additional trips to a critical move threshold - especially when the trips are distributed on the road network. Therefore, the

project will not have a significant direct project-level impact on the LOS standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

However, the County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. This program is based on a summary of projections method contained in an adopted planning document, as referenced in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 (b)(1)(B), which evaluates regional or area wide conditions contributing to cumulative transportation impacts. Based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing circulation element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, state, and federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

The proposed project generates two trips per month. These trips will be distributed on circulation element roadways in the unincorporated county that were analyzed by the TIF program, some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. These project trips therefore contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact and mitigation is required. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which will be required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, will mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

In order to mitigate its incremental contribution to significant cumulative traffic impacts, the proposed project will pay the TIF prior to obtaining building permits.

In order to mitigate its incremental contribution to significant cumulative traffic impacts, the proposed project will pay the TIF prior to obtaining building permits.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Master Plan Zone and is not adjacent to any public or private airports; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not significantly alter traffic safety on Paraso Avenue and Jamacha Boulevard. A safe and adequate site distance shall be required at all driveways and intersections to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Public Works. All road improvements will be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. Roads used to access the proposed project site are up to County standards. The proposed project will not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The project is not served by a dead-end road that exceeds the maximum cumulative length permitted by the Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County; therefore, the project has adequate emergency access.

- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No on-site or off-site parking is required or proposed. The proposed project is an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility. Thus, parking will not result in an insufficient capacity on-site or off-site.

- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an unmanned telecommunications facility. The implementation will not result in any construction or new road design features; therefore, will not conflict with policies regarding alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve any uses that will discharge any wastewater to sanitary sewer or on-site wastewater systems (septic). Therefore, the project will not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded storm water drainage facilities. Moreover, the project does not involve any landform modification. Refer to the Minor Storm water Management Plan dated August 14, 2006 for more information. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not involve or require water services from a water district. The project is for an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility that does rely on water service for any purpose.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project for an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility and will not produce any wastewater; therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment providers service capacity.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility and will not generate any solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within San Diego County.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility and will not generate any solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within San Diego County. Therefore, compliance with any Federal, State, or local statutes or regulation related to solid waste is not applicable to this project.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. There is no substantial evidence that there are biological or cultural resources that are affected or associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
DELACRUZ JAIME & PERLA G	ZAP 00-108
CHURCH OF GOD OF PROPHECY HOLDI	ZAP 01-056, P61-118
SPRING VALLEY SANITATION DISTRICT	P03-103
HOM YOW&NATSUMI FAMILY TRUST 09	S02-046
LAPRESA PLAZA L L C	S00-007

Less Than Significant Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are adverse effects on human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances.
(www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).
(<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000
(<http://www.dark-skies.org/file-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997.
(www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003.
(www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA.
(<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.
(www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System.
(<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965.
(www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996.
(www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.
(www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2.
(www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987.
(<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996.
(endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002.
(migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov>), (www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection

Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service
Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A
Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water
Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources
State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, California's
Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003.
(www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No.
8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, §
8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES
General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL
ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction
Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm
Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000
et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board,
Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan.
(www.swrcb.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division
7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and
Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994.
(www.sdcountry.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>.)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan,
2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water
Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance,
Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7,
Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory
Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68.
Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined
Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972,
Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-
Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United
States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220,
1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994.
(www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water
Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality
Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997.
(www.sandag.org)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES
Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water
Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin.
(www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and
Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land
Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San
Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines,
2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources
Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations,
Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title
14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001.
(ceres.ca.gov)

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51,
California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and
Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title
8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84:
Project Facility. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989.
(www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land
Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and
amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000.
(ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance,
compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631.
1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego
County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by
Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and
Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press
Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq.
1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS
Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS)
Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)

Eilar, Douglas and Smith, Justin D., Noise Impact Analysis, Eilar Associates, 2006

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). (www.sandag.org)

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

ND05-07\0619008-ISF;jcr